

Marin
10/750,511

REMARKS

The undersigned requests a personal interview with the Examiner in charge of this application to discuss the issues raised below.

The disclosure was objected to because of a typographical error in the specification. This has been corrected.

Claims 1 and 8 were objected to because of informalities. These have been corrected.

It is noted that misnumbered claims 15, 15, and 16 and have changed to 15, 16, and 17.

Claims 1, 2, 5-9, 11, and 14-17 were rejected as being unpatentable over Blair 246,061 in view of Naikaido 3,810,354.

Claim 3 was rejected as being unpatentable over Blair in view of Naikaido in further view of Grosskopf.

Claim 4 was rejected as being unpatentable over Blair and Naikaido in further view of Yang 6,565,253.

Claims 1 and 16 were rejected as being unpatentable over Yang in view of Naikaido.

Blair discloses an astronomical clock with a wheel surrounding and spaced from the clock face which makes one complete rotation a year (see Col. 1, lines 38-41). On the wheel is a calendar. The Examiner construes the wheel to be a bezel. It is believed that if the wheel of Blair is not directly adjacent the face of the clock, it would not be considered a bezel. Also, since the wheel in Blair takes one year to make a rotation, there would be no visible movement of the wheel from a cursory look. In the present invention, movement of the rotating bezel is highly visible since it is geared to the second hand of the watch. In addition, the claimed invention is for a wrist watch so that it is believed that Blair is non-analogous art in this context.

Marin
10/750,511

Naikaido shows a wrist watch with a second hand. According to the Examiner, it would be obvious in view of this reference to connect the wheel of Blair to a second hand. The motivation for doing this is not clear. Except for the teachings of this application, why would one want to add a second hand to Blair and connect the wheel which rotates once a year to the second hand.

Grosskopf was cited for the use of gems in a watch.

Yangs shows a wrist watch with a rotatable bezel. In this reference the bezel is rotated by hand. It is believed there is a big difference between a rotatable bezel and a rotating bezel which is driven by a second hand of a wrist watch. Again, without the teachings of this application, where is the motivation for modifying this reference in this way.

Frank has a celestial clock for automatically indicating the time of the day, the date of the year, the times of sunrise and sunset, and the positions of the sun and the planets. In other words, there are lots of moving members, but no watch hands. The Examiner did not identify the part of the celestial clock which is considered to be the bezel. In the rejection of claims using this reference, it is cited in combination with Blair and Naikaido. Blair does not have a second hand, Naikaido has a second hand but no rotating bezel and Frank does not have any hands. It is not clear just exactly how these references can be combined and where the motivation would come to do so.

In view of the art cited by the Examiner, claim 1 has been amended to limit the subject matter to a wrist watch with the relationship of the transparent cover to the watch face and the casing as clearly illustrated in Fig. 6. There is nothing in the above references which would or could suggest this combination of features as recited in the claim.

It is noted that none of these references teaches or suggests the idea of a wrist watch in which a bezel is continuously rotating, so there is no basis for combining any of these references.

Claim 16 has been canceled.

Marin
10/750,511

The remaining claims, all depending from claim 1, add further details of the invention including the feature of altering the ratio of rotation between the bezel and the second hand. The details added by these claims are not taught in these references, the Examiner finding unrealistic suggestions in the references for combining them.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that the claims in their present form clearly distinguish over the art cited and should be allowed.

A conscientious effort has been made to place this application in condition for immediate allowance. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned or Mr. Kroll if further changes are required to obtain allowance of the application.

A favorable action is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



LEONARD BELKIN

Reg. No. 18,063

Tel 301-254-8549

for

Michael I. Kroll

Reg. No. 26,755

171 Stillwell Lane

Syosset, NY 11791

Tel 516-367-7777

Dated: May 28, 2006

CERTIFICATE OF FAXING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the U. S. Patent and Trademark Office, telephone number 571-272-8300 on May 28, 2006.



Leonard Belkin